

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria Virginia 22313-1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/626,547		07/25/2003	Yasuyuki Okuda	0445-0340P	1174	
2292	7590	09/26/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			HILL, LA	HILL, LAURA C		
PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
				3761		
			DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	7,
10/626,547	OKUDA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Laura C. Hill	3761	

		Laura C. Hill	3/61	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE RE	PLY FILED <u>14 September 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE TH	HIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
thi: pla (3)	e reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or a sapplication, applicant must timely file one of the follows the application in condition for allowance; (2) a National a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in composing time periods:	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a lotice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	iffidavit, or other evidence with 37 (	ence, which CFR 41.31; or
a) 🛚	The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of	of the final rejection.		
b) 🗌	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the statutory period for reply expires and the statutory period	nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(		IRST REPLY WAS FILE	DWITHIN IWO
been filed CFR 1.17 above, if c earned pa	s of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension (a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened shecked. Any reply received by the Office later than three monther term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. tatutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)
2.	e Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in confiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any are a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)	), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.
	ne proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection	but prior to the date of filing a brie	f will not be entered	hecause
(a)	They raise new issues that would require further c	onsideration and/or search (see NO		because
	<ul><li>☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE bel</li><li>☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be</li></ul>		aduaina ar cimplifuina	the issues for
	appeal; and/or			tile issues ioi
(a)	They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)		jected claims.	
4. 🔲 Th	the amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
	oplicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(		·	
6. 🔲 Ne	ewly proposed or amended claim(s) would be non-allowable claim(s).		, timely filed amendm	ent canceling
7. 🛭 Fo. hov	r purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a with the new or amended claims would be rejected is presented to the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an	explanation of
	im(s) allowed:			
	im(s) objected to:	·		
	nim(s) rejected: <u>6-11,13,15 and 16</u> . nim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
	/IT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
	e affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b	out before or on the date of filing a N	Notice of Appeal will n	ot be entered
bed	cause applicant failed to provide a showing of good a display was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
ent	e affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filin ered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to owing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
	ne affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanati ST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.
11. 🛛 TI	ne request for reconsideration has been considered been Response to After Final Remarks.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
	ote the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)	. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).	•	
	ther:			
		TATYANA ZALUKAEV	/A	
D,		SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EX		
		<b>∕</b> . I	<del>,</del>	

20 Juli

Art Unit: 3761

## Response to After Final Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 14 September 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The evidence (e.g. Tables 1 and 2) submitted after the final rejection mailed 14

June 2006 will be entered because Applicant did show good and sufficient reasons why the evidence was not earlier presented as per 37 CFR 1.116e (see Remarks page 6).

Specifically, Examiner believes that Table 1 is in direct response to comments made in a final rejection with regards to the tensile ratios of the present invention versus the Comparative examples of Okuda and in response to other comments. However, this evidence does not show the present invention has achieved unexpected results as discussed in the final Office action and additionally as per the reasons discussed below.

In attempting to show the comparative between the closest prior art (Okuda WO/0053140) and the claimed invention in "Table 1" submitted 14 September 2006 and the "Comparative Data" submitted 4 April 2006, Examiner would like to point out that Okuda does not disclose in the specification the extension ratio under a given load, the type of elastic member used, the number of elastics, or the gather pitch. Okuda is silent as to what type of elastic is used in the standing gathers and there are a wide range of elastic material types, sizes and number of strands, filaments, etc which are all variables that can affect how quickly or slowly the standing elastic gathers stretch and contract before, during and after application of an absorbent article on a wearer. It is unclear to the Examiner how Applicant's have chosen "Lycra 780 dtex" and "Lycra 940 dtex" with 4 and 5 elastic members in Table 1 dated 14 September as a representative

Art Unit: 3761

of the type of elastic used by Okuda. Furthermore, it is unclear how the "gather pitch" of Table 1 is related to how the distance between standing gathers, fixing extension ratio and rate of increase of tensile load purportedly contribute to standing leg gathers that enable the caregiver to put the article on in a sitting or standing position. Moreover, even if there is a clear nexus between "gather pitch" and Applicant's invention, this variable is not positively recited in the claims or discussed in the specification.

With respect to Table 2, Okuda does not disclose the load over a specific gather length and it appears as these values in graphs A,B,C that supposedly represent Okuda have been arbitrarily chosen. Moreover, there is no apparent nexus between the combination of ratio widths, fixing extension ratio and rate of increase of tensile load since there is no evidence that these variables rather than unclaimed variables such as type of elastic material, number of elastics, etc. directly influence the ability of the standing gathers to contract without leakage in order to be placed on a wearer while standing. Thus, the evidence submitted by Applicant after (and before) the final rejection is deficient with respect to establishing unexpected results and novelty and is therefore insufficient to overcome the rejection as previously discussed with respect to Okuda.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura C. Hill whose telephone number is 571-272-7137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday (hours vary).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tatyana Zalukaeva can be reached on 571-272-1115. The fax phone

Art Unit: 3761

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Laura C. Hill Examiner Art Unit 3761

LCH